

TNM1 – TASK 1: PROJECT PROPOSAL WITH STRATEGIES

USER INTERFACE DESIGN – C773

PRFA – TNM1

TASK OVERVIEW

SUBMISSIONS

EVALUATION REPORT

EVALUATION REPORT – ATTEMPT 1 – REVISION NEEDED

Overall Evaluator Comments

EVALUATOR COMMENTS

The discussion reviews the shortcomings of the current website and proposes several changes including a new bird owner page. The sitemap and wireframe are satisfactory. Some aspects need attention to ensure specific task and rubric criteria are fulfilled, and an adequate level of detail is observed to demonstrate competency. The submission aspects must review the needs of 1) the audience (end-users) and separately 2) the business stakeholders (owners of the site) and how they are impacted or remain unfulfilled. A consultation with a course instructor is recommended.

A1. Unmet Content Needs of Audience and Stakeholders

Competent The submission logically describes how the current website content fails to meet audience and stakeholder needs.

There are no comments for this aspect.

A2. Unmet Functionality Needs of Audience and Stakeholders

Approaching Competence The submission does not logically describe how the current website functionality fails to meet audience needs or stakeholder needs.

EVALUATOR COMMENTS: ATTEMPT 1

A discussion is provided with useful detail. A discussion related to which functionality shortcomings affect 1) the audience furthermore 2) stakeholders is not clearly discussed. Both groups need to be discussed with clarity as to which functionality issues affect either group.

A3. Unmet Navigation System Needs of Audience and Stakeholders

Approaching Competence The submission does not logically describe how the current navigation system fails to

meet audience needs or stakeholder needs.

EVALUATOR COMMENTS: ATTEMPT 1

A discussion is provided about the navigation issues with the current site. The discussion needs to be better organized to discuss and distinguish the failures and how the 1) audience and 2) business stakeholders' needs are not meet. Both groups need to be clearly and separetly discussed.

B1. Functionality and Micro Interactions

Competent The submission logically explains the necessary website functionality and micro interactions needed to meet *both* audience and stakeholder needs.

There are no comments for this aspect.

B2. Content for New Page

Approaching Competence The submission describes the type of content that will be used for 1 new page, but the content is not logically based on 1 of the new user personas, or the description does not include how the elements of the content align directly to the chosen user persona.

EVALUATOR COMMENTS: ATTEMPT 1

A bird page is selected. The content is limited in detail to meet the rubric criteria and a holistic discussion that aligns with the chosen user persona.

B3. Explanation of content removal or redevelopment

Approaching Competence The submission does not accurately identify existing content from the website that will be removed or redeveloped or does not logically explain how that content fails to meet audience and stakeholder needs.

EVALUATOR COMMENTS: ATTEMPT 1

The discussion discusses redeveloping some content like the FAQ, among other items. The discussion does not meet the rubric expectations for logically explaining how the content fails to meet the audience and the business stakeholders' needs. Both groups needs to be discussed clearly.

B4. Visual Sitemap

Competent The submission includes a visual sitemap that logically determines the structure and the hierarchy of the site content, accurately aligns with the UI specifications, and accurately includes *each* of the given points.

EVALUATOR COMMENTS: ATTEMPT 1

A satisfactory visual sitemap that includes a bird's page along the existing content is evident.

B5. Explanation of Audience and Stakeholder Needs

Competent The submission logically explains how the information architecture meets audience and stakeholder needs.

There are no comments for this aspect.

B6. Navigation

Approaching Competence The submission does not logically explain the primary and secondary navigational elements required to support the information architecture.

EVALUATOR COMMENTS: ATTEMPT 1

A navigation discussion is provided. Clarity and details of the primary and secondary navigational elements are not clearly identified and discussed.

B6a. Audience and Stakeholder Navigation needs

Not Evident The submission does not explain how navigational elements align with audience or stakeholder needs.

EVALUATOR COMMENTS: ATTEMPT 1

This aspect is pending until aspect B6 meets competence, and additional alignment with both the audience and stakeholder needs must be observed.

C. Wireframe

Competent The submission includes a mid-fidelity wireframe that logically determines the layout for the homepage, is sized for a desktop website, and accurately includes *each* of the given points.

There are no comments for this aspect.

D. Maintenance Plan

Competent The submission includes a detailed maintenance plan for the responsive website that accurately aligns with the “Paradigm Pet Professional UI Design Specifications” and accurately includes one maintenance task for *each* of the given points.

EVALUATOR COMMENTS: ATTEMPT 1

A logically detailed maintenance plan is observed.

E. Professional Communication

Not Evident Content is unstructured, is disjointed, or contains pervasive errors in mechanics, usage, or grammar. Vocabulary or tone is unprofessional or distracts from the topic.

EVALUATOR COMMENTS: ATTEMPT 1

This aspect is pending until all other aspects meet competency requirements at which time the professional communication aspect will be reviewed in light of the rubric expectations for organization, terminology, mechanics, and grammar.